

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated December 3, 2004, the Examiner required restriction to one of the following groups under 35 U.S.C. §121:

Group I:	Claims 1-15 and 29-32	Drawn to a method for emulating a network of two or more distinct logic systems, class 709, subclass 224
Group II:	Claims 16-21 and 33-73	Drawn to a method and system for enabling multiple processor processing across physically distributed network and translating an address indication, class 709, subclass 218
Group III:	Claims 22-24	Drawn to a method of an emulation wall for connecting an emulation subnetwork to an outside network and detecting response datagrams to be transferred outside network, class 709, subclass 226
Group IV:	Claims 25-28	Drawn to a method of countering attacks in a network, class 709, subclass 220

In response thereto, applicant elected group I, with traverse. In a subsequent Office Action dated April 20, 2005, the Examiner required further restriction to one of the following groups under 35 U.S.C. §121:

Group I:	Claims 1-15	Drawn to a method for emulating a network of two or more distinct types of logic systems, class 709, subclass 224
Group II:	Claims 29-32	Drawn to a method of providing deception at a computer system on a network, class 709, subclass 220


In response thereto, applicant provisionally elects Group II, with traverse. The basis of the traverse were outlined in Applicants previous election.

However, in order to expedite prosecution of this application, Applicants herein are amending the claims such that all of the claims have an undisputable relationship and are drawn to providing deception at a computer system on a network.

Appl. No. 09/696,893
Amdt. Dated August 22, 2005
Reply to Office action of April 20, 2005

QUINE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP
P.O. BOX 458, Alameda, CA 94501
Tel: 510 337-7871
Fax: 510 337-7877
PTO Customer No.: **22798**
Deposit Account No.: **50-0893**

Respectfully submitted,


Stephen J. LeBlanc
Reg. No: 36,579